

U.S. PTO Customer No. 25280

Case No.: 6048

REMARKSThe Pending Claims

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in this application.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 11 2006

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action dated January 5, 2006, included the following rejections, objections, and comments:

1. Claims 1-8 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent Number 6,720,539.
2. Claims 1-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent Number 6,497,951.
3. Claims 1-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent Number 6,855,421.
4. Claims 1-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent Number 6,680,117.
5. Claims 1-8 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 9-31 of co-pending application number 10/424,120.
6. Claims 1-12 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of co-pending application number 10/299,154.
7. Claims 1-12 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 9-18 and 22-25 of co-pending application number 10/423,575.

U.S. PTO Customer No. 25280

Case No.: 5048

In response to these rejections, Applicant provides the following Remarks:

1. Rejection of Claims 1-8 as an Obvious-Type Patenting Over U.S. 6,720,539.
Claims 9-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent Number 6,720,539. Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herein.
2. Rejection of Claims 1-12 as an Obvious-Type Patenting Over U.S. Patent Number 6,497,951.
Claims 1-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent Number 6,497,951. Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herein.
3. Rejection of Claims 1-12 as an Obvious-Type Patenting Over U.S. Patent Number 6,855,421.
Claims 1-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent Number 6,855,421. Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herein.
4. Rejection of Claims 1-12 as an Obvious-Type Patenting Over U.S. Patent Number 6,680,117.
Claims 1-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent Number 6,680,117. Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herein.
5. Provisional Rejection of Claims 1-8 Over Co-Pending Application Number 10/424,120.
Claims 9-12 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-31 of copending application number 10/424,120. Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herein.
6. Provisional Rejection of Claims 1-8 Over Co-Pending Application Number 10/299,154.
Claims 1-12 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of co-pending application number 10/299,154. Application number 10/299,154 was abandoned for

U.S. PTO Customer No. 25280

Case No.: 5048

failure to respond to an office action on August 21, 2006 therefore Applicants respectfully believe this rejection is moot.

7. Provisional Rejection of Claims 1-8 Over Co-Pending Application Number 10/423,575.

Claims 1-12 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 9-18 and 22-25 of co-pending application number 10/423,212. Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer herein.

Conclusion

The Applicants having addressed all of the rejections, objections, and comments in the latest Office Action, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above Amendments and Remarks. In the event that the Examiner believes that the claims would be allowable with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.


Fee Authorization: In the event that there are additional fees associated with the submission of these papers, Applicant hereby authorizes the Commissioner to withdraw those fees from our Deposit Account No. 04-0500.

Extension of Time: In the event that additional time is required to have the papers submitted herewith for the above referenced application to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for any additional time required to make these papers timely and authorization is hereby granted to withdraw any additional fees necessary for this additional time from our Deposit Account No. 04-0500.

October 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Legal Department
Milliken & Company
920 Milliken Road (M-495)
P.O. Box 1926
Spartanburg, SC 29304


Cheryl J. Brickley
Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration Number 56891
Tel # (864) 503-1540
Fax # (864) 503-1999